



Grant Evaluator Feedback Summarization

2005-2007 Application Cycle

February 11, 2005

1. Did you feel you were provided adequate orientation to complete your task?

All 22 evaluators strongly believed they were provided adequate orientation.

If not, what was missing?

N/A

2. What part of the evaluation process or evaluation materials was the most helpful?

Two mainly helpful things were the staff comments and the evaluator's reference guide (blue book criteria). The initial review of the application from WSDOT staff helped in deciding whether or not the application was complete. The training and the quality of the application assembly made it easy to find what I was looking for.

3. What part of the evaluation process was the most difficult?

Although the criteria was helpful, it was also hard to use. Trying to maintain a consistent prospective during and between all of the evaluations was difficult, as well as trying to decide the priority. It would have been helpful if the projects' numerous tasks and needs weren't lumped into one. The length of time given and how many bundles of documents that had to be sifted through was difficult. It would be nice if there were some weighted criteria.

4. How could the evaluation process be improved?

Having some kind of electric template of information would have been helpful, as well as a smaller size of forced pairs evaluation sheet. One thing that quite a few evaluators suggested was to have a lesser volume of grants, and to increase the time to review them. To have some kind of ranking strategy that you could use would be nice.

5. How many hours would you estimate that you devoted to project evaluation?

4 – 10 HRS

11 – 16 HRS

17 – 25 HRS

26 – 60 HRS

4 Evaluators

8 Evaluators

6 Evaluators

4 Evaluators

Do you feel you were given adequate time to complete this process?

21 out of 22 evaluators believed they had adequate time to complete the process.

(cont. On 2)



If not, how much time would you recommend be given in the future?

One evaluator believed that another 2 weeks to complete the process would be helpful.

6. Did the evaluator packet contain adequate information FROM WSDOT?

21 out of 22 evaluators believed the packets held adequate information from WSDOT.

If not, what would have been helpful?

One evaluator believed that the criteria should have provided more explanation and detail, and written in a way that everyone in the group of evaluators can understand.

7. What additional information FROM THE APPLICANTS would have helped you to evaluate the projects?

A standardized form used in the applications would have made it easier to compare each application, and questions on the application should have been answered more clearly. Many of the applications were very wordy, which made them somewhat lose the point they were making. Questions regarding management experiences and finances should be required to be answered. More self-criticism should have been shown.

8. Did you find the application format easy to follow?

18 out of 22 evaluators found the format easy to follow. The remaining 4 did not answer.

If not, what could be done to improve the application format?

Some suggestions included making the pages shorter, and limiting the responses. Also, there was a lot of non-essential information that should have been filtered.

9. Did the application cover what you considered the essential information?

18 out of 22 evaluators, for the most part, thought it covered the essential information.

The 4 remaining did not answer.

If not, what was missing?

Some felt that there should have been more emphasis on intergovernmental coordination

Was the evaluation process what you expected?

14 out of 22 evaluators said that the evaluation process was what they were expected.

(cont. on 3)



5 of the evaluators did not comment.

3 of the evaluators said that it was not what they expected.

If not, how was it different from your expectation?

The evaluation process turned out being tougher than the 3 evaluators expected, and it took more time than was anticipated.

10. Would you prefer to send score sheets in electronically via email?

15 out of the 22 evaluators preferred sending score sheets in via email.

2 of the evaluators did not comment.

5 of the evaluators said no, and that they preferred doing it manually.

11. Would you be willing to serve as an evaluator in the future?

20 out of the 22 evaluators said they would be an evaluator in the future.

2 of the evaluators did not answer.

12. Is there someone you would recommend to serve as an evaluator in the future?

15 out of the 22 evaluators either said no or did not comment at all.

Casey Stevens – Stillaguamish Tribe

Mark Garrity - SW WSDOT Office (Vancouver)

Bill Wiebe – TPO

Lance Durbin – People for People, Yakima

Dick Larman – CTED

Francois Larrivee – Hopelink

Vicki Cummings – Grays Harbor C.O.G. (Aberdeen)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- The Public Trans. Staff did an excellent job developing and managing the process
- This was a really efficient, logical process
- The review meeting at the end was not necessary
- Concerned that a few evaluators had a real preference that differed from most evaluators. (Preference for tribes.)
- I'd rather evaluate all projects to provide the best context for comparison. It would not be a big job (I've done it in the past) but I think it would provide a more balanced result.
- Overall, it was a very good process.